

**Title II Project Application**  
**Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

**Project Number** (Assigned by federal unit): 116-406      **AMOUNT REQUESTED:** \$158,400.00

**2. Project Name:** Yale Creek Fish Passage Improvement

**3. County:** Jackson

**4. Project Sponsor:** BLM

**5. Date:** 3-4-03

**6. Sponsors Phone #:** 541 618 2313

**7. Sponsor's E-mail:** john\_samuelson@or.blm.gov

**8. Project Location** (attach project area maps showing general and specific locations of project.)

a. 4<sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Applegate Subbasin #17100309

b. 5<sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Little Applegate River #1710030903

c. Legal Location:

Township 40S Range 2 W Section(s) 3

d. BLM District: Medford e. BLM Resource Area: Ashland

f. National Forest \_\_\_\_\_ g. Forest Service District \_\_\_\_\_

h. State / Private / other lands involved? ☐ Yes ☒ No

**9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:**

The proposed project will restore the natural channel bottom and consequently improve natural channel function and the upstream movement of aquatic organisms (steelhead, trout, amphibians, and macroinvertebrates) within the drainage. The drop from the existing culver to the plunge pool currently inhibits upstream migration of salmonids and other aquatic organisms.

**10. Project Description:** (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)

The existing culvert has been identified by the Rogue Basin Fish Access Team (RBFAT) as a partial barrier to migration of aquatic organisms. This culvert will be replaced with a bottomless arch.

**11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?**

\* Yes    No    If yes, then describe.

This project is in coordination with other Yale Creek fish passage improvements in an effort to remove all fish passage barriers listed by the Rogue Basin Fish Access Team within the Yale Creek drainage. U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is planning fish passage improvements on USFS land, and the Applegate Watershed Council (ARWC) continues to work on fish passage improvements on private land.

**12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation?** [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

X Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

**Title II Project Application**  
**Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

**13. Project Type (*check one*) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]**

- |                                                                                              |                                                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): _____ [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)] |                                                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]                     | * Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]                       |
| * Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]                                            | * Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]                    |
| * Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]                                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)] |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]                        |                                                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]: _____                  |                                                                     |

**14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]**

(Use workload measures used for the budget process)

- |                                      |                                                                     |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. Total Acres: _____                | b. Total Miles: _____                                               |
| c. No. Structures: 1                 | d. Estimated People Reached (for environmental education projects): |
| e. No. Of Laborer Days: 30 work days |                                                                     |
| f. Other (specify): _____            |                                                                     |
| g. Program Element: JH               |                                                                     |

**15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date [Sec. 203(b)(2)]:** September 31, 2004

**16. Target Species (plants/wildlife etc.) Benefited:** (if applicable): Klamath Province steelhead, rainbow trout, sculpin, amphibians (e.g. Pacific Giant salamander, an important stream predator), also reptiles, mammals.

**17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved?** [Sec. 2(b)(3)]: This project will improve the cooperative relationships among federal agencies (BLM and USFS) and a community-based watershed council. Normally, these three entities work independently; however, these groups are making a concerted effort to coordinate fish passage improvement in one drainage. This will allow us to monitor the improvements in steelhead populations within the Yale Creek system. In addition, this project will improve relationships with downstream private landowners (who are cooperating with their own barrier removal projects), improve access for recreational users, and reduce road problems for commercial users.

**18. How is this project in the best public interest?** [Sec. 203(b)(7)] **Identify benefits to communities?**  
This project will improve upstream migration and improve habitat for aquatic organisms. The public is especially interested in seeing steelhead runs improve for recreational, commercial, and aesthetic reasons. In addition, replacing the existing culvert with a bottomless arch will restore the natural stream channel in the area of the culvert, improving stream meander, erosion and deposition processes, and reducing the potential for downstream flood damage on public and private lands and roads.

**19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?** This project benefits BLM by improving the ability of all aquatic species to access upstream habitat on both BLM and USFS land. For example, steelhead spawning habitat is limiting fish production in this otherwise healthy stream; improving access to upstream spawning areas should immediately increase the numbers of this important fish. In addition, improving upstream migration is especially important for species that must recolonize upstream areas after disturbance (e.g. wildfire).

**Title II Project Application**  
**Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

**20. Status of Project Planning**

- |                                                   |      |                             |                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| a. NEPA Complete:                                 | Yes  | * No                        |                                         |
| b. If No, give est. date of completion: Summer 04 |      |                             |                                         |
| c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:         | *Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:        | *Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | Not Applicable                          |
| e. Survey & Manage Complete:                      | Yes  | <input type="checkbox"/> No | * Not Applicable                        |
| f. DSL/ODFW* Permits Obtained:                    | Yes  | * No                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| g. DLS/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:     | Yes  | * No                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:                    | Yes  | No                          | * Not Applicable                        |
| i. Project Design(s) Completed:                   | Yes  | * No                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |

\* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer.

**21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment**

- |                                                 |                                            |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| * Contract                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Workforce |
| County Workforce                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Volunteers        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ |                                            |

**22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? (Sec. 204(e)(3))**

- ☐ Yes      \* No

**Title II Project Application**  
**Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

**23. Anticipated Project Costs** [Sec. 203(b)(3)]

- a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$158,400.00
- b. Is this a multi-year funding request?    Yes    \* No    If yes, then display by fiscal year
- c. FY04 Request:    \$158,400
- d. FY05 Request: \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- e. FY06 Request: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**\*\*\* Note:** *If you have a complex budget, add it as an appendix. The Resource Advisory Committee will want to know specifically how the funds will be spent.*

<b>Item</b>	<b>Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]</b>	<b>Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]</b>	<b>Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]</b>	<b>Total Available Funds</b>
24. Field Work & Site Surveys		3,000.00		3,000.00
25. NEPA & Sec.7 ESA Consultation		9,000.00		9,000.00
26. Permit Acquisition		1,000.00		1,000.00
27. Project Design & Engineering		4,000.00		4,000.00
28. Contract Preparation		2,000.00		2,000.00
29. Contract Administration		4,000.00		4,000.00
30. Contract Cost		120,000.00		120,000.00
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies				
33. Monitoring		1,000.00		1,000.00
34. Other				
35. Project Subtotal		144,000.00		144,000.00
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multiple year projects)		14,400.00		14,400.00
37. Total Cost Estimate		<b>\$158,400.00</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$158,400.00</b>

**38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding in Column C. Above** [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

**Title II Project Application**  
**Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

**39. Monitoring Plan** (Sec.203 (b)(6))

- a. **What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] **Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?** As part of the RBFAT monitoring protocol, USFS and BLM will monitor whether fish passage is improved with a combination of snorkeling and spawning gravel surveys. BLM has several years of pre-project surveys already in place. BLM will also monitor flows (summer, winter) and channel characteristics through the new bottomless arch to ensure that passage velocity and substrate requirements are met. No plans are in place to monitor amphibian or insect passage at this time.
- b. **How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] **Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?** The BLM would use competitive local contractors to replace of this culvert.
- c. **What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act?** [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] **Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?** Through established routes of public feedback, the ARWC will collect information on improved public recreational, commercial, or flood safety experiences.
- d. **Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33)**  
Amount: \$1,000.00

Title II Project Application  
Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

